

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/867,418	HORI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lyle A Alexander	1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lyle A Alexander.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Darling. JPD

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 January 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: Nakagawa et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicants' proposed amendments that specify only selected impurities are measured and that the measurement occurs when the polycrystalline silicone is in a liquid phase. Such amendments appear to overcome the art of record.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Lyle A Alexander
Examiner's signature, if required